

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/825,973	04/05/2001	Norio Hirashita	OKI.227	3710
20987 7	590 08/08/2005		EXAM	INER
VOLENTINE FRANCOS, & WHITT PLLC			MALDONADO, JULIO J	
ONE FREEDO	M SOUARE			
11951 FREEDOM DRIVE SUITE 1260			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
RESTON VA	20190		2823	

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

D.1

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/825,973	HIRASHITA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Julio J. Maldonado	2823				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 Ma	a <u>y 2005</u> .					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) <u>1-16,24,26,28 and 30-34</u> is/are pendir	ng in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) <u>1-16,24,26,28 and 30-34</u> is/are rejected	ed.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:						
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 						
Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
	·					
Attachment(s)	. 🗖					
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) 🔲 Notice of Informal Pa	atent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20030617</u> .	6)					

Art Unit: 2823

DETAILED ACTION

1. The rejection as set forth in paper mailed on 11/16/2004 is withdrawn in view of Applicants' amendments and arguments.

- 2. The cancellation of claims 23, 25, 27 and 29 is acknowledged.
- 3. Claims 1-16, 24, 26, 28 and 30-34 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 24, 26, 28, 30 and 31-34 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imai (U.S. 6,344,675 B1) in view of Mineji (U.S. 5,807,770).

Imai (Figs.12-13D) teach a low resistance SOI-FET device including an insulating layer (2); a semiconductor layer (3) formed on the insulating layer (2), wherein the semiconductor layer (3) includes the channel region therein; a pair of impurity layers (9, 10) formed in regions which are respectively in contact with the channel region in the source region and the drain region; and a pair of metallic silicide layers (16) respectively formed in the source region and the drain region, wherein the pair of metallic silicide layers (16) are respectively in contact with the pair of impurity layers (9, 10), wherein bottom surfaces of the pair of metallic silicide layers (16) extend to bottom surfaces of the semiconductor layer (3), wherein the thickness of the metallic silicide layers (16) is

Art Unit: 2823

equal to or more than 80% of form an upper surface of the metallic silicide layers (16) to the bottom surface of the semiconductor layer; wherein the metallic silicide layers (16) are composed of refractory metal and silicon, and wherein a ratio of the metal to the silicon in the metallic silicide layers is X to Y, wherein the metallic silicide layer comprises cobalt silicide (column 22, line 66 – column 25 line 21 and column 43, line 6 – column 48, line 63).

Furthermore, Imai in another embodiment of the invention teaches wherein the source and drain regions extend between the cobalt silicide layers formed in said source and drain regions and the bottom surface of the semiconductor region (see, Fig.10).

Imai fails to expressly teach that the ratio of metallic silicide having the lowest resistance among stoichiometric metallic silicides is X0 to Y0, and X, Y, X0 and Y0 satisfy the following inequality: (X/Y) > (X0/Y0); wherein a ratio of cobalt to silicon is one to α (1< α <2); and wherein a contact specific resistance between the metallic silicide layers and the impurity layers is less than $1 \times 10^{-7} \Omega$ -cm⁻².

However, Mineji (Figs.3A-3G and 6A-6B) teaches an MOSFET-SOI device including a pair of metallic silicide layers (10A, 10B) respectively in contact with a pair of impurity layers (5, 6) of the MOSFET, wherein the metallic silicide layers (10A, 10B) are composed of refractory metal and silicon, and wherein a ratio of the metal to the silicon in the metallic silicide layers is X to Y, wherein the metallic silicide layer is a rich metallic silicide layer of the formula M₅Si₃ and wherein said metal used to form said silicide layer

is selected from a group including cobalt, titanium, nickel and tungsten (column 5, line 57 – column 9, line 2 and column 10, lines 30 – 38).

Furthermore, according to Brodsky et al. (U.S. 6,323,130 B1), CoSi₂ is the lowest resistance silicide phase of cobalt (column 2, lines 50 - 58).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Imai and Mineji to enable the silicide contact of Imai according to the teachings of Mineji because this would result in a silicide layer without defects such as agglomerations, cracks and voids (column 3, lines 35 - 39).

Still, the combined teachings of Imai and Mineji fail to expressly teach wherein a ratio of cobalt to silicon is one to α (1< α <2). However, in the case where the claimed ranges "overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art" a prima facie case of obviousness exists. MPEP 2144.05. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the ratio of cobalt to silicon disclosed in the combined teachings of Imai and Mineji to arrive at the claimed invention.

Furthermore, since the same material are treated in the same manner, the recited results would be obtained, i.e., the combined teachings of Imai and Tung inherently teach wherein a contact specific resistance between the metallic silicide layers and the impurity layers is less than $1 \times 10^{-7} \Omega$ -cm⁻².

6. Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imai ('675 B1) in view of in view of Mineji ('770) as applied to claims

Art Unit: 2823

1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 24, 26, 28, 30 and 31-34 above, and further in view of the Applicants Admitted Prior Art.

The combined teachings of Imai and Mineji substantially teaches all aspects of the invention but fails to show wherein said FET device includes a depletion layer, which expands to bottom surfaces of the source region and the drain region when a voltage is supplied to the gate electrode thereof. However, the prior art teaches FET devices include a depletion layer, which expands to bottom surfaces of the source region and the drain region when a voltage is supplied to the gate electrode thereof (Instant pages 1-2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Imai and Mineji with the prior art to enable including the structure resulting in the depletion layer of the prior art in the device of Imai and Mineji.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 and 23-34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicants are encouraged, where appropriate, to check Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) (http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair) which provides applicants direct secure access to their own patent application status information, as well as to general patent information publicly available.

Application/Control Number: 09/825,973

Art Unit: 2823

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to examiner Julio J. Maldonado whose telephone number

is (571) 272-1864. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

10. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Matthew Smith, can be reached on (571) 272-1907. The fax number for this

group is 571-273-8300. Updates can be found at

http://www.uspto.gov/web/info/2800.htm.

Julio J. Maldonado Patent Examiner Art Unit 2823

Page 6

Julio J. Maldonado August 1, 2005

George Fourson
Primary Examiner